


PageID #144), which the Magistrate Judge already considered in her Report and Recommendation. (See Doc. No. 17 at 3-4 (“Plaintiff also contends that discovery should take place to determine the nature of the The Joint Corp.’s relationship with the other Defendants.”)). Thus, this objection does not provide a basis to reject or modify the Report and Recommendation. See *VanDiver v. Martin*, 304 F. Supp. 2d 934, 937 (E.D. Mich. 2004) (“An ‘objection’ that does nothing more than state a disagreement with a magistrate's suggested resolution, or simply summarizes what has been presented before, is not an ‘objection’ as that term is used in this context.”).

Plaintiff also objects to arguments made by The Joint Corp. (See Doc. No. 27 at PageID #27). However, this objection is without merit because it fails to identify an error by the Magistrate Judge. See *Howard v. Sec. of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991). Plaintiff’s request for leave to file a Second Amended Complaint is not properly before the Court because he failed to seek leave to amend from the Magistrate Judge. See *Murr v. United States*, 200 F.3d 895, 902 n. 1 (6th Cir. 2000) (“[W]hile the Magistrate Judge Act, 28 U.S.C. § 631 *et seq.*, permits *de novo* review by the district court if timely objections are filed, absent compelling reasons, it does not allow parties to raise at the district court stage new arguments or issues that were not presented to the magistrate.”). Moreover, Plaintiff fails to identify or describe the substance of the amendments he would make, as required by the Court’s Local Rules. See Local Rule 15.01(a)(1).

The Clerk is directed to close the file.

It is so **ORDERED**.


WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE